17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
8		
9	SCOTT BRUMETT,	
10	Petitioner,	No. C 04-05423 JSW
11	V.	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE AND
12	ANTHONY KANE,	DENYING MOTION TO DISMISS AS MOOT
13	Respondent,	
14	and BOARD OF PRISON TERMS and	
15	ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, Governer, Real Parties in Interest,	
16	/	

On June 2, 2005, Respondent filed a motion to dismiss the petition for writ of habeas corpus filed in this case on December 23, 2004. On July 5, 2005, Petitioner filed his first amended petition in apparent response to Respondent's motion.

In his amended petition, Petitioner again seeks federal habeas corpus relief by claiming the California Board of Prison Terms ("the Board") has violated the Due Process Clause of the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution by its repeated denials of parole to Petitioner; and that the Board has violated the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution by its repeated denials of parole to Petitioner. Liberally construed, the claims appear potentially colorable under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 and merit an answer from Respondents.

Accordingly, for the foregoing reasons and for good cause shown:

1. Petitioner shall serve by certified mail a copy of this Order and the amended petition and all attachments thereto upon Respondents.

2.	Respondents shall file with the Court and serve on Petitioner, within 60 days of the date of this Order, an answer conforming in all respects to Rule 5 of the	
	Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, showing cause why a writ of habeas	
	corpus should not be issued. Respondents shall file with the answer and serve of	
	Petitioner a copy of all portions of the administrative record that are relevant to a	
	determination of the issues presented by the petition.	

3. If Petitioner wishes to respond to the answer, he shall do so by filing a traverse with the Court and serving it on Respondents within 30 days of his receipt of the answer.

TATES DISTRICT JUDGE

In light of the filing of the amended petition, the motion to dismiss is DENIED AS MOOT.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 26, 2005